UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/752,935	12/29/2000	Patrick J. Shaughnessy	LOT9-2000-0030 US1	9225

27085 7590 09/01/2005

IBM CORPORATION
LOTUS SOFTWARE
ONE ROGERS STREET
CAMBRIDGE, MA 02142

EXAMINER	
SMITH, PETER J	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2176	

DATE MAILED: 09/01/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/752,935	SHAUGHNESSY ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Peter J. Smith	2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *26 May 2005*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1,2,4-7 and 9-22* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1,2,4-7 and 9-22* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: amendment filed on 5/26/2005.

2. The rejection of claims 1, 18 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite is dropped in light of Applicant's amendments to these claims.

3. The rejection of claim 22 under 35 U.S.C. 101 for being directed to non-statutory subject matter is dropped in light of Applicant's amendment to this claim.

4. Claims 1-2, 4-7, and 9-22 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 2, 6, 9, 12, 15, 17, 18, 19, 20, and 21 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

6. Claims 1-2, 4-7, 18-19, and 22 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sorge et al. (hereinafter "Sorge"), US 6,613,098 B1 filed 6/15/1999.

Regarding independent claims 1 and 18, and 22, Sorge teaches operating a browser at a first local machine to display a user interface to a place including an editor selection control and from within the browser, upon selection of the editor selection control, automatically launching a corresponding editor for editing a document in col. 3 lines 21-61 and col. 7 lines 33-51. Sorge teaches upon closing the corresponding editor, loading the document as a compound document including a document file in the format of the corresponding editor together with an HTML version to a server in fig. 2, col. 3 lines 9-61, col. 7 lines 33-51, and col. 13 line 56 – col. 16 line 60.

Sorge teaches operating a browser to download the compound document from the server, and rendering the document as a working copy document for editing at the local machine using an HTML rendering created by a native application on the local machine in fig. 3, col. 3 lines 9-61, and col. 16 line 61 – col. 18 line 12. Sorge teaches editing and saving the working document on a local machine and responsive to saving the edited version of the working document on the local machine, loading the edited version of the working document as a revised compound document including a revised document file in the format of the native application together with an HTML version to the server in fig. 2, col. 3 lines 9-61, col. 7 lines 33-51, and col. 13 line 56 – col. 16 line 60.

Sorge does not specifically teach the first and second browser respectively operated on first and second local machines. Sorge does teach in col. 1 line 45 – col. 2 line 38 that a wide variety of data may be shared among different users in a network environment using HTML.

Sorge teaches here how a server maintaining HTML files may be used as a collaboration space to exchange content among different users. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Sorge to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have enabled a second browser on a second local machine to have downloaded, edited, and then uploaded the compound document to the server to have implemented a collaborative environment as is taught by Sorge in col. 1 line 45 – col. 2 line 38.

Regarding independent claims 2 and 19, Sorge teaches a place browser, editor, and data storage for editing and storing a data file in fig. 4 and col. 18 line 15 – col. 19 line 53. Sorge teaches providing at a browser a user interface to a place, said user interface including an upload control in col. 3 lines 21-61 and col. 7 lines 33-51. Sorge teaches executing round trip editing to prepare a data file including launching a native application, using the native application to selectively create and edit the object, saving the object to the data file and closing the native application, and upon closing the native application, loading the data filed to the upload control for uploading to the place as a compound file including the data file and an HTML version of the object in fig. 2, col. 3 lines 9-61, col. 7 lines 33-51, and col. 13 line 56 – col. 16 line 60. Sorge teaches upon loading the data file to the upload control, copying the data file to a place server for conversion and storage as an application enabled object in the place in col. 3 lines 21-61 and col. 7 lines 33-51. Sorge teaches rendering the application enabled object at a browser and at the browser executing the round trip editing to prepare a revised data file in fig. 3, col. 3 lines 9-61, and col. 16 line 61 – col. 18 line 12.

Sorge does not specifically teach the first and second browser respectively operated on first and second local machines. Sorge does teach in col. 1 line 45 – col. 2 line 38 that a wide variety of data may be shared among different users in a network environment using HTML. Sorge teaches here how a server maintaining HTML files may be used as a collaboration space to exchange content among different users. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Sorge to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have enabled a second browser on a second local machine to have downloaded, edited, and then uploaded the compound document to the server to have implemented a collaborative environment as is taught by Sorge in col. 1 line 45 – col. 2 line 38.

Regarding dependent claim 4, Sorge teaches creating the data file using an editor application independently of the place in collaboration space in col. 3 lines 21-61 and col. 7 lines 33-51. Sorge teaches importing the data file into the place and responsive to user selection at the user interface, loading the data file from the place to the browser in col. 3 lines 21-61 and col. 7 lines 33-51. Sorge teaches launching the editor application and opening the data file in the editor application for further editing at the browser in col. 3 lines 9-18 and col. 7 lines 33-51.

Regarding dependent claim 5, Sorge teaches creating the data file using an editor application independently of the place in collaboration space and then importing the data file into the place in col. 3 lines 21-61 and col. 7 lines 33-51. Sorge teaches responsive to user selection at the user interface, loading the data file form the place to the browser, launching the editor application, and opening the data file in the editor application for further editing at the browser in col. 3 lines 9-18 and col. 7 lines 33-51.

Regarding independent claim 6, Sorge teaches opening a user interface to the place at a browser, operating the user interface to launch an office application, and using the office application to create a document in col. 3 lines 21-61 and col. 7 lines 33-51. Sorge teaches upon closing the corresponding editor, loading the document as a compound document including a document file in the format of the corresponding editor together with an HTML version to a server in fig. 2, col. 3 lines 9-61, col. 7 lines 33-51, and col. 13 line 56 – col. 16 line 60.

Sorge teaches operating a browser to download the compound document from the server, and rendering the document as a working copy document for editing at the local machine using an HTML rendering created by a native application on the local machine in fig. 3, col. 3 lines 9-61, and col. 16 line 61 – col. 18 line 12. Sorge teaches editing and saving the working document on a local machine and responsive to saving the edited version of the working document on the local machine, loading the edited version of the working document as a revised compound document including a revised document file in the format of the native application together with an HTML version to the server in fig. 2, col. 3 lines 9-61, col. 7 lines 33-51, and col. 13 line 56 – col. 16 line 60.

Sorge does not specifically teach the first and second browser respectively operated on first and second local machines. Sorge does teach in col. 1 line 45 – col. 2 line 38 that a wide variety of data may be shared among different users in a network environment using HTML. Sorge teaches here how a server maintaining HTML files may be used as a collaboration space to exchange content among different users. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Sorge to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have enabled a second browser on a

second local machine to have downloaded, edited, and then uploaded the compound document to the server to have implemented a collaborative environment as is taught by Sorge in col. 1 line 45 – col. 2 line 38.

Regarding dependent claim 7, Sorge teaches responsive to user creation or edit of a place document based on the office application, automatically launching the office application to allow the user to edit the document using the office application in col. 3 lines 21-61 and col. 7 lines 33-51.

7. Claims 15 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sorge et al. (hereinafter "Sorge"), US 6,613,098 B1 filed 6/15/1999 in view of Skarbo et al (hereinafter "Skarbo"), US 6,317,777 B1 filed 4/26/1999.

Regarding independent claim 15, Sorge teaches a place browser, editor, and data storage for editing and storing a data file in fig. 4 and col. 18 line 15 – col. 19 line 53. Sorge teaches providing at a browser a user interface to a place, said user interface including an upload control in col. 3 lines 21-61 and col. 7 lines 33-51. Sorge teaches executing round trip editing to prepare a data file including launching a native application, using the native application to selectively create and edit the object, saving the object to the data file and closing the native application, and upon closing the native application, loading the data filed to the upload control for uploading to the place as a compound file including the data file and an HTML version of the object in fig. 2, col. 3 lines 9-61, col. 7 lines 33-51, and col. 13 line 56 – col. 16 line 60. Sorge teaches upon loading the data file to the upload control, copying the data file to a place server for conversion and storage as an application enabled object in the place in col. 3 lines 21-61 and col.

7 lines 33-51. Sorge teaches rendering the application enabled object at a browser and at the browser executing the round trip editing to prepare a revised data file in fig. 3, col. 3 lines 9-61, and col. 16 line 61 – col. 18 line 12.

Sorge does not specifically teach the first and second browser respectively operated on first and second local machines. Sorge does teach in col. 1 line 45 – col. 2 line 38 that a wide variety of data may be shared among different users in a network environment using HTML. Sorge teaches here how a server maintaining HTML files may be used as a collaboration space to exchange content among different users. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Sorge to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have enabled a second browser on a second local machine to have downloaded, edited, and then uploaded the compound document to the server to have implemented a collaborative environment as is taught by Sorge in col. 1 line 45 – col. 2 line 38.

Sorge does not teach that the user interface and the editing application are loosely coupled through the state of the document and can be closed independently of the other. Skarbo teaches wherein a browser user interface and an editing application are loosely coupled through the state of a shared document and can be closed independently of the other in fig. 7, fig. 8, and col. 10 line 36 – col. 11 line 40. In Skarbo a registry is used to launch a corresponding independent application on the local machine for a shared document obtained through the separate browser interface. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Sorge and Skarbo to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have maintained a

loose association between the browser user interface and the editor application such that a user could have independently modified the shared document as is taught by Skarbo in col. 10 line 36 – col. 11 line 40.

Regarding dependent claim 16, Sorge teaches creating the data file using an editor application independently of the place in collaboration space in col. 3 lines 21-61 and col. 7 lines 33-51. Sorge teaches importing the data file into the place and responsive to user selection at the user interface, loading the data file from the place to the browser in col. 3 lines 21-61 and col. 7 lines 33-51. Sorge teaches launching the editor application and opening the data file in the editor application for further editing at the browser in col. 3 lines 9-18 and col. 7 lines 33-51.

8. Claims 9-14, 17, and 20-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bookspan et al. (hereinafter "Bookspan"), US 6,629,129 B1 filed 6/16/1999 in view of Sorge et al. (hereinafter "Sorge"), US 6,613,098 B1 filed 6/15/1999.

Regarding independent claims 9 and 20, Bookspan teaches operating a browser at a client to display a user interface to a place, the user interface including a new selector in fig. 2, fig. 4, col. 3 line 30 – col. 4 line 9. Bookspan teaches responsive to a user selection of the new selector, displaying in the user interface a list of available page types, the list including choices corresponding to page editing applications installed on the client in fig. 2, fig. 4, col. 3 line 30 – col. 4 line 9, and col. 9 lines 7-20. Bookspan teaches responsive to user selection of an editing application from the list, displaying a new scene including an upload control and a file icon representing the file being created, and launching the editing application in the foreground

displaying the file as a new, empty file in fig. 2, fig. 4, col. 3 line 30 – col. 4 line 9, and col. 9 lines 7-20.

Bookspan does not teach that the user interface and the editing application are loosely coupled through the state of the document and can be closed independently of the other. Bookspan does not teach responsive to the user closing the editing application, detecting that the file is no longer being edited and bringing the user interface to the place to the foreground, converting the file to a hypertext file, and displaying the file in the upload control. Bookspan does not teach responsive to the user publishing the file, uploading to the server the file along with its equivalent hypertext file and at the server attaching the file to the equivalent hypertext file to the same place document.

Skarbo teaches wherein a browser user interface and an editing application are loosely coupled through the state of a shared document and can be closed independently of the other in fig. 7, fig. 8, and col. 10 line 36 – col. 11 line 40. In Skarbo a registry is used to launch a corresponding independent application on the local machine for a shared document obtained through the separate browser interface. Sorge does teach responsive to the user closing the editing application, detecting that the file is no longer being edited and bringing the user interface to the place to the foreground, converting the file to a hypertext file, and displaying the file in the upload control in col. 3 lines 21-61 and col. 7 lines 33-51. Sorge does teach responsive to the user publishing the file, uploading to the server the file along with its equivalent hypertext file and at the server attaching the file to the equivalent hypertext file to the same place document in col. 3 lines 21-61 and col. 7 lines 33-51.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Sorge and Skarbo into Bookspan to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have maintained a loose association between the browser user interface and the editor application such that a user could have independently modified the shared document as is taught by Skarbo in col. 10 line 36 – col. 11 line 40. It would have been obvious and desirable to have converted the document as a hypertext file and loaded the document and corresponding hypertext file to the place so that other users could have used browser programs to have viewed the document while the document still retained the formatting information of the original document as taught by Sorge in col. 3 lines 21-31.

Regarding dependent claim 10, Bookspan does not teach attaching the file and the equivalent hypertext file to the same document. Sorge does teach attaching the file and the equivalent hypertext file to the same document in col. 3 lines 21-61 and col. 7 lines 33-51. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Sorge into Bookspan to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have converted the document as a hypertext file and loaded the document and corresponding hypertext file to the place so that other users could have used browser programs to have viewed the document while the document still retained the formatting information of the original document as taught by Sorge in col. 3 lines 21-31.

Regarding dependent claim 11, Bookspan does not teach generating a list using a hidden ActiveX upload control download to the client from a server, the ActiveX upload control generating the list by listing only those applications for which the upload control successfully

obtains a pointer to respective automation server objects. Sorge does teach generating a list using a hidden ActiveX upload control download to the client from a server, the ActiveX upload control generating the list by listing only those applications for which the upload control successfully obtains a pointer to respective automation server objects in col. 7 lines 33-51. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Sorge into Bookspan to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have converted the document as a hypertext file and loaded the document and corresponding hypertext file to the place so that other users could have used browser programs to have viewed the document while the document still retained the formatting information of the original document as taught by Sorge in col. 3 lines 21-31.

Regarding independent claims 12, 17, and 21, Bookspan teaches operating a browser at a client to display a user interface to a place, the user interface including an edit selector in fig. 2, fig. 4, col. 3 line 30 – col. 4 line 9. Bookspan teaches responsive to user selection of the edit selector, displaying an edit scene including an upload control, the upload control including a document icon representing the document being edited, and launching the editing application in the foreground displaying the document in fig. 2, fig. 4, col. 3 line 30 – col. 4 line 9, and col. 9 lines 7-20.

Bookspan does not teach that the user interface and the editing application are loosely coupled through the state of the document and can be closed independently of the other. Bookspan does not teach responsive to the user closing the editing application, detecting that the file is no longer being edited and bringing the user interface to the place to the foreground, converting the file to a hypertext file, and displaying the file in the upload control. Bookspan

does not teach responsive to the user publishing the file, uploading to the server the file along with its equivalent hypertext file and at the server attaching the file to the equivalent hypertext file to the same place document.

Skarbo teaches wherein a browser user interface and an editing application are loosely coupled through the state of a shared document and can be closed independently of the other in fig. 7, fig. 8, and col. 10 line 36 – col. 11 line 40. In Skarbo a registry is used to launch a corresponding independent application on the local machine for a shared document obtained through the separate browser interface. Sorge does teach responsive to the user closing the editing application, detecting that the file is no longer being edited and bringing the user interface to the place to the foreground, converting the file to a hypertext file, and displaying the file in the upload control in col. 3 lines 21-61 and col. 7 lines 33-51. Sorge does teach responsive to the user publishing the file, uploading to the server the file along with its equivalent hypertext file and at the server attaching the file to the equivalent hypertext file to the same place document in col. 3 lines 21-61 and col. 7 lines 33-51.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Sorge and Skarbo into Bookspan to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have maintained a loose association between the browser user interface and the editor application such that a user could have independently modified the shared document as is taught by Skarbo in col. 10 line 36 – col. 11 line 40. It would have been obvious and desirable to have converted the document as a hypertext file and loaded the document and corresponding hypertext file to the place so that other users could have used browser programs to have viewed the document while the document still

retained the formatting information of the original document as taught by Sorge in col. 3 lines 21-31.

Regarding dependent claim 13, Bookspan does not teach saving the document to client storage as a web page including the text of the document and formatting information saved as tags together with support files or locating in the client storage and uploading the formatting information tags and support files. Sorge does teach saving the document to client storage as a web page including the text of the document and formatting information saved as tags together with support files and locating in the client storage and uploading the formatting information tags and support files in col. 3 lines 21-61 and col. 7 lines 33-51. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Sorge into Bookspan to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have converted the document as a hypertext file and loaded the document and corresponding hypertext file to the place so that other users could have used browser programs to have viewed the document while the document still retained the formatting information of the original document as taught by Sorge in col. 3 lines 21-31.

Regarding dependent claim 14, Bookspan teaches responsive to the user selecting the edit selector, displaying the edit scene including indicia representing the document and automatically launching an application for editing the document displaying the document in its original form in fig. 2, fig. 4, col. 3 line 30 – col. 4 line 9. Bookspan does not teach responsive to the user making changes to and closing the document, again uploading to the server the document and all support files.

Sorge does teach responsive to the user making changes to and closing the document, again uploading to the server the document and all support files in col. 3 lines 21-61 and col. 7 lines 33-51. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Sorge into Bookspan to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have converted the document as a hypertext file and loaded the document and corresponding hypertext file to the place so that other users could have used browser programs to have viewed the document while the document still retained the formatting information of the original document as taught by Sorge in col. 3 lines 21-31.

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments filed 5/26/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Regarding Applicant's argument that Sorge does not teach the workflow as presented in the amended claims, the Examiner respectfully disagrees. The Examiner notes that Sorge teaches in col. 1 lines 58-59 that HTML is used for sharing a wide variety of data among users. Thus, Sorge teaches documents that may be collaboratively shared over a network via the HTML format. The Examiner also notes that Sorge teaches in col. 3 lines 9-18 that it aims to teach publishing a native format document into HTML with associated native data files so that a "round trip" editing of the information can be performed. Thus, based on these teachings, Sorge suggests to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention that a native document can be published into HTML with an associated native format file such that the HTML can be collaboratively shared through downloading to a second user using a second browser. Thus, the

Examiner believes Sorge provides teachings and suggestions leading one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have considered Applicant's invention as claimed.

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 9-17, 20, and 21 regarding that neither Sorge nor Bookspan teach a browser interface loosely coupled to an editing application wherein the user interface and the editing application can be closed independently of the other, have been considered but are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection. The Examiner has searched and found the prior art reference of Skarbo et al. (hereinafter "Skarbo") which teaches a shared document interface browser which enables a client user to retrieve a document. Once the document is retrieved an application is launched via an association to a document through a document registry on the local client machine. Thus, the browser user interface and editing application are loosely coupled and can be independently closed from one another. Skarbo further teaches in col. 6 line 66 – col. 7 line 8 that both a HTML and native version of the document may be maintained on the collaborative place server.

Conclusion

10. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Peter J. Smith whose telephone number is 571-272-4101. The examiner can normally be reached on Mondays-Fridays 7:00am-3:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather R. Herndon can be reached on 571-272-4136. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

PJS
8/25/2005

William L. Bashore
WILLIAM BASHORE
PRIMARY EXAMINER
8/29/2005